

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 31 2006

Attorney docket OKI 282

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for promptly arranging the personal interview of August 22 and also for sending a courtesy copy of the resulting interview summary, which saved the Applicant several days in prosecution. [Required Applicants' summary: the issues were discussed as noted by the Examiner.]

The Applicants submit that entry of this amendment is proper, for the following reason: the presently-requested amendment at the end of claim 1, which was suggested by the Examiner at the interview, is unrelated to any outstanding rejection. It addresses a concern of the Examiner which is not of record and was first mentioned to the Applicants on August 22, 2006. Therefore, the Applicants could not have been expected to make this amendment earlier, i.e., prior to the final rejection.

With respect, the outstanding rejection is based on a mis-apprehension, as the Examiner explains in the Interview Summary; and the mis-apprehension appears to be the entire basis of the rejection. Moreover, the Applicants already traversed the rejection on the same basis of mis-apprehension in their earlier response.¹ Following that response, it would have been proper for the Examiner to either allow the claims or to make a new, non-final rejection.

¹ The Applicants argued, e.g., "Walley states that its circuit limits the "maximum excursion," i.e. the upper limit data (col. 2, lines 52 and 63); there is no disclosure of any *lower* limit data. The clipping is "conventional" (col. 2, line 48) and conventional clipping is understood to be for reducing loud signals, which are always high, not low. Even if conventional clipping were taken to mean something else, there would still be no disclosure of two distinct data limits, as claimed. Murata in Fig. 25 does not disclose two limit data, but instead only a single limit datum 104 (i.e., a single absolute value), where the same value 104 is applied to positive and negative excursions beyond a certain amplitude."

AMENDMENT

9

09/996,929


Attorney docket OKI 282

In view of these facts, the Applicants respectfully request entry and allowance of claims 1-3, or else a non-final office action containing a new ground of rejection.

As to the other independent claims 8, 10, and 17, the Applicants request Examiner's reconsideration of the arguments previously submitted on January 31, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

August 31, 2006
Date


Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
(717) 426-1664
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 571-273-8300) on August 31, 2006.

Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478]

Signature



AMENDMENT

10

09/996,929